

Appl. No. 09/880,734
Amdt. dated May 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2007

PATENT

Amendments to the Drawings:

Replacement drawings for six sheets including Figures 2, 7-13 and 16-17 have been prepared by a competent draftsman and are included as an appendix. Applicants request that these drawings be substituted for these figures currently on file in the application. No changes have been made to the content of the drawings and no new matter has been added. Therefore, no marked-up sheets have been included.

Attachment: 6 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-7, 10-15, 44 and 46-54 were pending. In this amendment, no claims are amended or canceled. Claims 55-59 are added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-7, 10-15, 44 and 46-59 will be pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indicated allowability of claims 1-7 and 10-15.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Yokouchi and Van de Steeg in view of May

Claims 44, 46-50, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokouchi (4,796,211), in view of Van de Steeg (5,479,618) and May (6,414,368).

Claims 44, 46-54

Claim 44 is allowable over the cited references, either alone or in combination, as those references fail to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 44. For example, claim 44 recites:

after loading the first magic value into the reload register, loading a value other than the second magic value or the third magic value into the reload register, which causes the watchdog timer circuit to generate a triggered signal.

Yokouchi describes the use of a watchdog timer for a CPU. See *Yokouchi*, col. 1 lines 36-54. "During operation, if the 1EH and OEIH data are successively written to the watchdog timer within 16ms (at 12 MHz), the watchdog timer resets and starts counting again from 0." *Id.*, col. 1 lines 42-45. "If the combination of the data to reset the watchdog timer is not written within the fixed time, the watch dog timer generates a carry signal," which resets the CPU. *Id.*, col. 1 lines 48-51. Thus, the cause for a carry signal is an absence of the values 1EH and OEIH being written within a fixed time period, resulting in the overflow of the counter.

In contrast, claim 44 recites that actively loading a value other than a second or third magic value causes the watchdog timer circuit to generate a triggered signal. Note that Yokouchi does not describe any other mechanisms for causing a generation of a carry signal.

Van de Steeg is cited as teaching an external source for configuration data. *See* Office Action, page 4. May is cited as teaching "operating a programmable logic integrated circuit wherein the programmable logic integrated circuit and another circuit [e.g., watchdog timer] are disposed on the same die." *Id.* Even assuming that Van de Steeg and May teach these limitations and that there is a motivation to combine, these teachings do not make up for the deficiencies in Yokouchi with respect to claim 44.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that claim 44 and its dependent claims 46-54 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 55-59

Applicants submit that independent claim 55 should be allowable for at least the same rationale as claim 44. Claims 56-59 depend from claim 55 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

Other rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May, Yokouchi and Steeg as applied to claims 48 above, and further in view of Muller, US Patent 6298360.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May, Yokouchi and Steeg as applied to claims 44 above, and further in view of Laiho et al., US Patent 6754830, hereinafter Laiho.

Claims 52 and 54, which are dependent on claim 44, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 44. Furthermore, the cited teachings of Muller and Laiho do not make up for the deficiencies in Yokouchi with respect to claim 44.

Appl. No. 09/880,734
Amdt. dated May 23, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/David B. Raczkowski/

David B. Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
JMZ:deb
60981488 v1